UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,137	09/26/2001	Awele Ndili	24286-712	1817

21971   7590   01/11/2006

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 PAGE MILL ROAD
PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1050

EXAMINER
SCUDERI, PHILIP S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 November 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37

CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for

continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely

paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 11/12/2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of

rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section
> 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the
> subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,826,597

(hereinafter "Lonnroth") in view of US 6,601,108 (hereinafter "Marmor").

5.   Regarding claims 1 and 7, Lonnroth teaches a method for delivering content to a mobile

device (210) from a network site (110) where the mobile device and network site may each employ

different communication protocols and mark-up languages relative to each other, the method

comprising:

        receiving a communication from the mobile device (see figure 2) corresponding to a request

for content from the network site (column 5 lines 62-65);

        converting the request in regard to whichever of the communication protocol and mark-up

language of the request differs from between the mobile device and the network site, such that each

of the communication protocol and mark-up language of the converted request matches the

communication protocol and mark-up language of the network site (WAP/WML is converted to

IP/HTTP; column 4 lines 2-5, column 6 lines 23-35);

        converting the content in regard to whichever of the communication protocol and mark-up

language of the content differs between the mobile device and the network site (IP/HTTP is

converted back to WAP/WML; column 9 lines 11-14) according to instructions stored in a database

that directs what network events are to be retrieved from the network site (column 5 lines 35-42),

such that each of the communication protocol and mark-up language of the converted content

matches the communication protocol and mark-up language of the mobile device (column 9 lines

11-14); and

        transmitting the converted content to the mobile device in the communication protocol and

mark-up language of the mobile device (figure 2).

6.   Identifying the communication protocols and mark-up languages employed by the mobile

device and the network site is an inherent feature because without some sort of identification of the

protocols used by the mobile device and the network site Lonnroth would not be able to perform

the protocol and mark-up conversions. Identifying the communication protocols and mark-up

languages implicitly identifies those that differ.

7.   Lonnroth does not disclose identifying the natural language formats employed by the mobile

device and by the network site or converting the request and response according to whichever of the

natural language formats differ. Nonetheless these features were well known in the art, as evidenced

by Marmor.

8.   Lonnroth does not expressly disclose that the database (254) is part of a database

management system. The examiner takes official notice that it was well known in the art to use a

database management system to access a database, thereby relieving application developers of the

burden of having to write or maintain database access code.

9.   Marmor teaches a similar conversion proxy that identifies the natural language format

employed by a client device and a network site and converting requests and responses between the

client device and the network site according to whichever of the natural language formats differ (e.g.,

column 9 lines 52-64). Given the teachings of Marmor, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to identify the natural language formats employed by the mobile device and

by the network site and to convert the request and response according to whichever of the natural

language formats differ, thereby enabling the client and server to exchange data when they support

different languages without requiring changes to be made to either the client or the server (see

Marmor, column 4 lines 25-31).

10.   Regarding claims 2 and 8, Lonnroth teaches signaling the converted request to the network

site (see figure 2).

11.   Regarding claims 3 and 9, Lonnroth teaches that the database determines how to construct

the XML request document (column 5 lines 35-42). The database must therefore at least comprise

communication protocol and mark-up language properties for different types of devices (e.g., for

devices that use IP/HTTP). Further enabling the database to store format properties would have

been obvious for the reasons discussed above in regards to claims 1 and 7.

12.   Regarding claims 4 and 10, Lonnroth teaches that the post-processor accesses a set of XSL

stylesheets that transform the response back to the client's format (e.g., column 8 lines 54-67).

Lonnroth doesn't appear to expressly disclose that the post-processor accesses the database (254) to

determine the client's format. However, doing so would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art because the post-processor must obtain this information from somewhere and because the

configuration database stores other related information such as the user's id etc (column 5 lines 32-

45).

13.   Regarding claims 5 and 11, Lonnroth does not expressly disclose identifying the standards

supported by the network site (110) by querying the network site. Marmor teaches querying a node

to determine the standards supported by the node (column 12 lines 25-27). Given the teachings of

Marmor and that Lonnroth is silent with respect to exactly how the system knows which standards

the network site (110) supports, it would have been obvious to look outside the teachings of

Lonnroth to Marmor to determine a way to identify the standards supported by the network site.

14.   Regarding claims 6, 12, and 19, Lonnroth discloses identifying how to convert the request

using a device ID (column 5 lines 35-42).

15.   Regarding claims 13 and 14, Lonnroth discloses that the system is capable of converting

communications between at least three different protocols (WAP, Protocol A, and Protocol B; see

figure 2).

16.   Regarding claims 15 and 16, Lonnroth discloses that the system is capable of converting the

communications between at least three different mark-up languages (HTTP, WML, XML; column 4

lines 1-5 and figure 2).

17.   Regarding claims 17, 18, and 21, Marmor discloses converting between at least three

different natural language formats (English, Hebrew, Chinese; column 11 lines 28-43, column 14 line

66).

18.   Regarding claim 20, Lonnroth discloses converting between WML and HTML (see figure 2).

19.   Regarding claims 22-26, Lonnroth discloses that users can be associated with XSL

stylesheets that that are used to customize their services (column 8 lines 39-52). The users must do

so through some sort of user interface. Customized stylesheets enable the rapid development of

customized interfaces by aiding the process of executing batch conversion code.

Conclusion

20.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

21.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Philip S. Scuderi whose telephone number is (571) 272-5865. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

22.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

23.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system,

contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PSS

KRISNA LIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER